

# Meeting Notes

Access & Transportation Issue Team

Date: January 7, 2002

Location: Redmond Library

Members Present: Larry Zak, Terry Eccles, Darrell Pieper, Clay Penhollow, Cary Penhollow, M.L. Norton, Brian Ferry, Mark DeVoney, George Palmer, Ray Hartwell, Kate Kimball, Jeff Boyer, Walt Schloer, Alan Unger, Larry Miller, Ron Wortman, Phil Paterno.

Members Absent:

Others Present: Terry Morton, Jean Schrader, Todd Dow

Comments:

---

## Agenda Item #1

Terry Morton, facilitator, led a discussion pertaining to Meeting Ground Rules and provided a handout, "Creating Rules for Higher Ground". The team prioritized the primary ground rules in the following order:

1. Respect the people and the process; Allow for a safe environment to express ideas opinions and values; Listen.
2. Periodically review and modify the process, as necessary;
3. Stay on time and task; Comments introduced should be relevant to the topic being discussed;
4. Be committed, knowledgeable and focused; Contribute;

The Team offered positive and negative aspects to the meetings. The negative aspects include, repeating the same issues in different ways, an adversarial atmosphere, personal agendas, "side tracks" to the topic, and reaching conclusions before all comments were presented. The positive aspects of the meetings include personal contacts, being able to establish and follow clear meeting objectives, and having participation that is direct and to the point.

**Public Participation** - Please refer to the Operating Principles described in the Working Group Charter which addresses public participation. All Issue Team meetings are advertized and public is encouraged. These meetings are intended to be working meetings for the participants and not public hearings for contentious issues. The Charter suggests designating a time for a public form. At our next meeting we can briefly discuss and establish a guideline for members of the general public to present their views.

The Team discussed **Issues** that were described in the Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) with the purpose of identifying areas that may have been overlooked. Remember, Issues are problems to be solved and there is presently no adequate direction or guidance to address it. Also, an Issue must be within the scope of the Decision to be made through the EIS process.

The following points were suggested by Team members during the discussion. A response is provided for each of the suggestions.

1. Cell phone towers - and a need to address requests in an expeditious manner.

Response - cell phone towers are included in the Issue Description on page 155 of the AMS. There is an existing process in place for addressing right of way applications for these uses.

2. Become proactive rather than reactive in the designation of transportation and utility corridors.

Response - It is the intent of the plan to provide guidance for selecting areas for right of way uses. Regional corridors have been designated in the old plan and will be recognized in our new plan. The designation of new transportation corridors such as the West Butte Road and the South Redmond extension is dependent on ODOT studies and the information that is provided by the ongoing planning efforts which includes, The South Redmond Collaborative Planning Group and the Millican Road Team.

3. It was suggested that the plan should provide guidance to address access to isolated parcels. The problem is that there is no guidance to concerning access to isolated parcels of private land.

Response - It is necessary to develop an issue description for this topic and subsequent alternatives that will include criteria addressing access to isolated private parcels.

4. A problem was described that pertains to the granting of rights of way to a particular holder and the impacts associated with the use of the right of way by the general public. Rights of way granted by BLM are non-exclusive rights and are therefore open to the public.

Response - the issue may be described as “When BLM grants rights of way, the routes are open to the public and such use often results in abuses such as illegal dumping, wood cutting, indiscriminate off road vehicle use, and the harassment of wildlife.”

5. A statement was made that there are no issues that clearly describe the degree or type of access and the level of access in certain areas.

Response - We recognize that there are numerous user created roads. BLM is working on a road inventory and has completed work in some areas of the planning unit. This is a pre-existing condition and is described in the Issue Description on page 155 of the AMS. We will address this issue in the alternatives section which will be discussed during the next few meetings.

6. Non-typical transportation systems have not been addressed.

Response - Develop an Issue Description explaining that there is an opportunity to develop routes for non-typical transportation systems on public land. This may not be a significant Access/Transportation issue, but one that is addressed by the Recreation Issue Team.

7. Concerns were expressed about considering the ADA in transportation and access.

Response - Issue Description - the reduction of existing road densities can limit access to public lands for people with disabilities.

8. A comment was made about whether issues should be limited because of budget constraints and the limits imposed on BLM to conduct road maintenance.

Response - Not necessarily. BLM road maintenance frequency is tied to road level categories. Roads are classified in categories ranging from 1 to 5. Funding requests are budgeted for facilities maintenance which includes buildings, projects and roads.

9. A comment was made about the social perspective of a road system.

Response - Driving for pleasure is a common recreational activity that occurs on a transportation system. Different levels of transportation system provide different experiences for users. It may be more appropriate to have this issue addressed by the Recreational Issue Team.

10. A concern was expressed about transportation development that it not regress or stagnate due to the lack of money, materials or equipment.

Response - Reduced budgets have made it difficult to maintain transportation systems are desired levels. The ability to control funding is not within the scope of this plan, however this will be considered within the content of alternatives and maintenance levels. and in the Environmental Impacts section of the EIS.

11. A concern was made about how to limit access from a County road onto public land.

Response - Why focus on just County roads ? Is there a problem with access to public lands from all major roads ? The issue of numerous concentrated access points is described in the Issue Descriptions on page 155.

Action Items (Who needs to do what and when is it due?)

Included in this mailing is a revision of the Issue Descriptions, based on our meeting. These are also being sent to the Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Intergovernmental Team. Any additional comments you may have about the revised Issue Descriptions may be presented at the Large Group Meeting on 1/29.

---

Next meeting date, location, purpose and what needs to be accomplished.

Large Group Meeting is scheduled at Eagle Crest on Tuesday, January 29<sup>th</sup> from 9 - 3 pm. The task will be to explore Desired Condition.

The Intergovernmental Team will meet on Wednesday, January 30<sup>th</sup> from 9 - Noon at the Best Western in Prineville. The IG Team will address the final Issue Descriptions.

We will use Desired Condition as a basis for preparing Issue Alternatives. Developing Issue Alternatives this will be the focus of the next few meetings.

The Access Transportation Issue Team will meet at the Redmond library from 9- 4 pm on:

February 4, 2002  
February 25, 2002

and on March 13<sup>th</sup> from 9 - 12